



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10123
Title of the Manuscript:	Embracing Continuous Auditing for Public Sector in Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Not substantial and impact enough to be considered as a journal. This article may appropriate as a proceedings. Major weaknesses: • Contributions not stated properly/not given • What is new? • Too little citations/references, indicate literature review not comprehensive enough • Section 2.1 cannot be understand • No literature or empirical evidence on all the models used • Reader unable to understand why this study is so important, apart for the particular country? • Two aims stated but seems the second aim was not achieved (missing in the write up) • Research method not robust, not structured, no reference with prior study • Results – only descriptive? Any other more scientific statistical analysis? It is recommended the author to affiliate or co-author with someone who got experience in publishing journal with impact factors.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Too many deficiencies.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer